DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 313 781 EA 021 446

AUTHOR Keedy, John L.; And Others
TITLE School-College Collaboration for School Improvement: A Case Study.
PUB DATE Nov 89
NOTE 22p.; Paper prepared for the Annual Meeting of the Southern Regional Council on Educational Administration (Columbia, SC, November 12-14, 1989).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; Case Studies; *College School Cooperation; *Cooperative Programs; Educational Development; Educational Improvement; Educational Quality; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Institutional Cooperation; Professors; School Districts; Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Carroll County School District GA; *West Georgia College

ABSTRACT

A case study in which an institute of higher education (West Georgia College) and a school district (Carroll County Schools, Georgia) collaborated on a two-year school improvement project is described. Five roles/perspectives--those of the college professor, superintendent, central office, principal, and teacher--are used to describe the three interrelated processes of collaboration, teacher change, and school improvement. A teacher collegial group project (TCG) was piloted at Temple Elementary School. The project was so successful that five high schools were invited to join the TCG program. The program continued to expand. Described are the participant perspectives in the following areas: (1) varying collaborative roles of the professor; (2) superintendents as collaborator/supporter; (3) director of secondary education as collaborator with institute of higher education (IHE), principals, and TCG facilitators; (4) principal as collaborator with the IHE and teachers; and (5) teacher collegial groups from the teacher's perspective. The meeting format and the Procedure are appended. (21 references) (SI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED313781

SCHOOL-COLLEGE COLLABORATION FOR SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT: A CASE STUDY

John L. Keedy
Assistant Professor
Educational Leadership
West Georgia College
Carrollton, GA 30118
(404)836-6557

Timothy A. Wheeler
Superintendent
Carroll County Schools
164 Independence Dr.
Carrollton, GA 30117
(404)832-3568

Sylvia Hartley
Director of
Secondary Education
Carroll County Schools
164 Independence Dr.
Carrollton, GA 30117
(404)832-3568

Kathleen Rogers
Principal
Central Primary School
175 Primary School Rd.
Carrollton, GA 30118
(404)832-6466

Becky Waldrep
Teacher
Temple Elementary School
95 Otis St.
Temple, GA 30179
(404)562-3218

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John L. Keedy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 021 446

A Proposal for the Southern Regional Council on Educational Administration, Columbia, South Carolina, November 12-14, 1989.

School-College Collaboration for School Improvement

A Case Study

A Nation at Risk: Imperative for School Reform (1983) has rekindled a school reform movement which links our national economic survival to improving our schools. Our nation's graduates must have the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in an increasingly technologically competitive global economy. We may now be in a school improvement era--as opposed to a state-mandated reform movement--in which teachers and principals are considered not the problem but the solution (Glickman, 1989). If individual schools end up being the units for school change and improvement (Pipho, 1988), collaboration between institutes of higher education (IHEs) and individual schools and districts should become the rule, not the exception. Schools have little time, however, to conceptualize models for school improvement. IHEs, according to Goodlad (1984), have a role to provide schools with models for school improvement, and then work with the schools as facilitators to implement these models.

This paper describes a case study in which an IHE (West Georgia College) and a school district (Carroll County Schools, Georgia) collaborated on a school improvement project. Five roles/perspectives--those of the college professor (John Keedy), superintendent (Tim Wheeler), central office (Sylvia Hartley, Director of Secondary Education), principal (Kathleen Rogers), and teacher (Becky Waldrep)--are used to describe the three interrelated processes of collaboration, teacher change, and school improvement. Given their positions, what are their perspectives and how did their roles evolve as they worked toward the common goal of improving Carroll County Schools?

Chronology of the Two-Year School Improvement Project

In the first year, 1988-89, Temple Elementary School (where Rogers was the principal and Waldrep one of the participating teachers) piloted a school improvement project, a teacher collegial group (TCG). Keedy, Wheeler, and Rogers collaborated in starting the project (August-October 1988). Mr. Wheeler and the dean of the college of

education, Evelyn Fulbright, agreed to cost-share substitute teachers so that the six teachers could meet from 12:30 to 3:30 instead of after school when they would be tired from their teaching.

This project at Temple Elementary School was so successful that the five high schools were invited to participate in the TCG program for 1989-90. Given the national concern for improvement in mathematics and science, teachers of these subjects comprised these groups. Three of the high schools decided to participate in the program along with another elementary school, Central Primary, and Temple for a second year for a total of five schools. As the program expanded in the second year, Hartley, the Director of Secondary Education, was assigned the central office coordination of the high schools. Keedy and Hartley worked together in supporting the efforts of the TCG groups in the high schools.

Definition of Teacher Collegial Groups

TCGs can help revitalize individual schools because this structure helps to professionalize and un-bureaucratize teaching (Maloy & Jones, 1988; Lortie, 1975; Jackson, 1968). By no means original to the 1980s, two prototypes are learning workshops (Kelley, 1951) and the federally-funded teacher centers of the 1970s. TCGs provide a school's teachers most committed to changing and improving their teaching an opportunity to be learners in the teaching process. TCGs can take several formats, but in this structured format each teacher formulates a year-long focus for the series of meetings, usually 8-10 per year. A primary-grade teacher might want to use less instructional time in reading groups and more whole-group instruction. A history teacher might want to use cooperative learning groups to encourage more student analysis of historical issues.

Teachers in the TCG deliberate upon alternatives to established practice. They become action researchers and try out their "gameplans," incremental steps listing strategies to be followed for two to four weeks to improve upon their year-long focus. TCG participants implement their gameplan within their individual classroom for a prescribed

period. At future TCG meetings, teachers update group members on their gameplan progress. This collegial interaction results in the formulation of another gameplan to be tested for the two to four weeks preceding the next meeting. As this cycle continues, teachers become analysts, problem-solvers, and informal researchers of their own teaching styles. Group members learn both from this cycle of experimentation with different instructional strategies and from each other through group interaction. Teachers collaborate on the renewal of their teaching by reflecting upon their work in the learning-teaching process. (Appendices A and B contain the meeting format and the procedure.)

Varying Collaborative Roles of the Professor

Keedy conceptualized the idea of TCGs, partly from his previous experience as assistant superintendent of instruction. He introduced the idea first to Temple Elementary School principal, Kathleen Rogers. Both then received the backing of the superintendent of schools, Tim Wheeler. Along with conceptualization and initiation, Keedy played a salesperson role: convincing the superintendent and principal that TCGs could work and benefit teachers, and selling the idea to Temple Elementary School teachers at a school faculty meeting.

During the first year, Keedy was the group facilitator for the Temple Elementary TCG where he played several roles: moderator, clarifier, participant, and resource provider. During the first three TCG meetings at Temple Elementary, he mainly encouraged the teachers to follow the group format. As soon as the teachers became used to the meeting format, he often played the role of summing up or helping to make classroom situations and gameplans clear to group members as each member presented. For the first four meetings he participated in suggesting possible gameplans for each presenter to consider adopting and trying out in the classroom for the next meeting. As soon as teachers became comfortable in sharing and offering instructional suggestions to each other, Keedy stopped offering suggestions and left this role to the teachers. Each teacher critiqued one journal article for the group at one meeting, and Keedy provided

possible journal articles for group members to use for these critiques.

During the first year Keedy collaborated with Rogers (usually by telephone) as opportunities to improve the project surfaced: How should West Georgia College and Carroll County Schools cost-share the provision of substitutes? Should teachers use journals during this project, and if so how? Should peer observation be used to enrich teacher presentations on gameplans, and, if so, how and when? At the end of the first year, he helped coordinate a recognition hour for the dean of the college of education and the superintendent of schools. The media attended and recognition plaques were presented by the Carroll County Educational Foundation, a local foundation whose purpose is to collaborate with businesses in improving the public schools.

As the TCGs expanded to four new schools during the second year, Keedy's role changed from direct service provider at one school to the trainer-of-trainers and coordinator roles. In July 1989 he conducted an orientation meeting for the principals: What are TCGs and how can they help improve teaching and school cultures? The principals then appointed the group facilitators, for whom Keedy conducted a four-hour workshop on such topics as the selection of teachers, formats for conducting TCG groups, and examples of year-long foci and gameplans used by teachers at Temple during the first year.

Superintendent as Collaborator/Supporter

The superintendent of the Carroll County School System, Tim Wheeler, believes that excellence in education comes about through a shared vision between community and school. This vision is based on the idea that people who work together for a common goal can bring about improvement. Since improvement does not come about without change, and since not all change is positive, Mr. Wheeler believes that the leader of any group must have a clear idea of what the group wants to accomplish in order to lead effectively.

When the college contacted Mr. Wheeler, who was in his first year as superintendent, about the possibility of forming teacher collegial groups, he was immediately enthusiastic about the idea. He saw these groups as a way to bring about the

type of positive change that he wanted in the school system by giving teachers an opportunity to communicate better among themselves. He believed that the TCGs would allow teachers to see what other teachers were doing in the classroom, to develop a shared consensus of what good teaching is all about, to talk about what was going on in their classrooms, and to share their successes and their frustrations. In essence, TCGs would give teachers opportunities for the support and growth which is all too often lacking in most school settings.

Wheeler and Fulbright, the West Georgia College dean of education, agreed to share the cost of a plan that would allow teachers to be released from school for half a day several times throughout the school year. This important agreement sent a signal to others that there was genuine support from the top. Wheeler liked the idea of having the teachers meet away from the school setting and offered the use of the board room at the central office for this purpose. He dropped in on several of the meetings to show his support of the program and to encourage the teachers in this project. In this setting, the teachers felt free to work collaboratively within the group.

The collaborative efforts of the college and the school system were beneficial to both parties. The close working relationship fostered mutual respect and a chance to find out more about the programs that each offered. The college continued to provide the services of Keedy, and the work of the Temple Elementary TCG gave Keedy a chance to gather first-hand information on the effectiveness of such groups. The project also gave Wheeler a chance to expand the circle of people who share his educational vision.

Director of Secondary Education as Collaborator with IHE, Principals, and TCG Facilitators

Because of the positive response of the teachers who worked with the TCG pilot program and the administrative belief that the support group had a positive impact on instruction, Mr. Wheeler decided to expand the program to the high school level the following year, 1989-90. Discussions among Wheeler, Keedy, and Sylvia Hartley led to

the decision to involve the high schools. Substitute pay for the teachers would come from secondary staff development funds which were Hartley's responsibility. Once these basic decisions were made, Hartley was placed in charge of the program coordination: dealing with questions and problems as they arose and serving as the contact between the college and the schools.

Since many teachers view central office staff members as evaluators and supervisors rather than as support personnel, all principals and group facilitators were told initially that the purpose of the teacher collegial groups was to empower teachers to support, analyze, and help themselves. The teachers themselves would conduct the meetings, and the information shared would be used to help one another become better teachers. These case studies of two high schools illustrate some of the roles that Hartley played in the coordination of the TCGs.

High School 1. This high school was not one of those originally selected to participate in the program because of its past history of resistance to change, especially when change originated with the central office. The principal, new to the school and the system, however, specifically asked to be included. This presented the first problem: Should the schools be told they would take part in the program or should they choose to participate? As Hartley reviewed the reasons for TCGs with Wheeler, it became obvious that forcing schools to participate was inconsistent with the most important underlying reason for teacher support groups: empowering schools and teachers to make decisions to help themselves. The decision to allow schools to decide whether or not they would participate was quickly made.

Later, when the teachers at this school voiced a concern over being away from their classes to participate in the program, Hartley worked with them to resolve the problem. The teachers wanted to get together on weekends or after school for their sessions, and hoped they could be paid what the central office would have paid substitutes for the nine half days the teachers would miss during the year. Since the budgeted money could not be

spent in this manner, a compromise was reached. The teachers agreed to meet in the mornings for some sessions, in the afternoon for others, and after school for still others. In this way the teachers would not miss the same classes each time.

High School 2. The principal at this school insisted that the facilitator be the assistant principal. Both Hartley and Keedy expressed concern that having an administrator as the group facilitator might inhibit group members in their dealings with one another. On the contrary, this arrangement has worked well. The assistant principal holds the firm conviction that teacher collegial groups are positive, viable solutions to the many problems facing classroom teachers, and her attitude is reflected in the optimism of the group as a whole.

The teachers here wanted to earn staff development credit for their group participation, and Hartley served as liaison for the teachers and the director of staff development. A staff development plan was worked out which allows them to earn five staff development units which can be used for Georgia teacher recertification.

These two abbreviated case studies illustrate that the central office roles of promoting, implementing, and supporting TCGs relate to a general function of problem-solver. The goals of this collaboration were improved teacher effectiveness and student learning. This improvement did not occur as a result of traditional, top-down methods of supervision and evaluation. Understanding this situational process is crucial in understanding the role of the central office staff member.

Principal as Collaborator with the IHE and Teachers

Rogers was excited to have the opportunity to implement TCGs. This was the first time that not only Temple Elementary School (TES) teachers but teachers throughout Carroll County Schools had the opportunity to participate in an organized support group helping teachers change and improve their teaching. Most importantly, the superintendent had provided release time for the teachers to participate in this process during the school day.

The principal's role in contributing to the TCG process was critical for the program to be successful. The principal had to be not only an instructional leader but also a key motivator and supporter of the TCG process. A major responsibility was ensuring that this opportunity was presented to the entire faculty as a positive and encouraging opportunity for instructional improvement. The TCG process was explained as a method for individual teachers to focus on themselves and their teaching styles. The success of the program would be based on individual attitudes of the teachers and not on some end result such as improved test scores. One teacher asked during the faculty presentation whether teachers would be evaluated on the objectives, i.e. year-long foci and was told that teachers would assess themselves and their peers rather than a school administrator doing an evaluation.

After the initial step of presenting and selling the program, Rogers selected the six participants. Teachers were asked to volunteer and from these volunteers six teachers were selected. Teachers with similar teaching situations and grade levels were given priority. The teachers selected also had to have a good working relationship and respect for each other. Most of the teachers needed a little push to commit to participate because the common complaint in participating was, "I don't want to be away from my students that often."

Next, the meeting dates were scheduled and a conference room at the county board office was reserved for each of the nine sessions. In this way teachers could concentrate on the task at hand rather than worrying about what was going on in the classroom. Substitute teachers also were scheduled for the meeting dates. Throughout the year, Rogers demonstrated support for the group. She informally chatted with the group members, and when enthusiasm waned, Rogers encouraged the teachers not to give up. Regardless of the situation Rogers believed that as principal she always had to be positive and supportive of the TCG teachers.

How successful was the TCG process and what effect did it have on the culture at Temple Elementary School? Initially, the process involved only the six teachers

participating. The enthusiasm of the teachers spread, however, and the other members of the faculty become involved. The school culture began to change as other teachers became interested in what members of the TCG were doing differently in their classrooms. The faculty became involved in the TCG process by asking questions, sharing ideas, and trying different approaches to handling situations in the classrooms. Staff morale improved and pride in being a teacher was once more evident.

Teacher change became evident as the participating teachers got involved in the TCG process and began trying new ways to teach. One teacher grew confident in her ability to teach effectively, another teacher gained the respect of her peers as she worked diligently with special education students and their regular education teachers, and a third teacher successfully implemented the use of learning centers in her classroom as part of her curriculum offerings. The TCG process has been an exciting way to initiate change in the classroom and has been beneficial not only to the teachers participating but also to the students with whom these teachers teach. Essentially, the TCG has helped make a collaborative culture at TES.

Teacher Collegial Groups From the Teacher's Perspective

The TES faculty takes great pride in their ability to pull together toward the common goal of providing the best educational experience possible for every child. This commitment was put to the test when six teachers were chosen to become "guinea pigs" in a pilot program sponsored by the Carroll County Board of Education and West Georgia College. When the TCG concept was explained to the faculty, the real selling point was the idea that teaching practices could be improved and enriched through collaboration without criticism. In this time of accountability for teachers, the concept of release time to discuss teaching strategies with peers seemed too good to be true: There had to be a catch somewhere. The teachers also were concerned with leaving substitutes in classrooms, but their principal assured them that in the long run the students would benefit from the new ideas brought back by the teachers.

At the beginning Dr. Keedy seemed to have reservations as to the willingness of teachers to share areas that needed improvement for fear that it might be seen as weaknesses in their teaching skills. That was not the case with this group of teachers. Each teacher was confident in his or her teaching ability and clearly respected the abilities of the other five teachers. There was also a gentlemen's agreement which meant that any "embarrassing moments" would stay within the group. Before the first meeting, the halls were alive with teachers speculating as to what would be expected from the TCG during the year. This interest in the TCG and what "they" were doing continued to be a topic of interest the entire year. The sharing of information not only helped the six participants, but the entire faculty.

At the first meeting, the purpose and procedures were explained to the group. The teachers were asked to identify year-long foci for improvement. As the teachers shared their projected foci, members helped to clarify the goals so that everyone had a clear understanding of what each person was doing. The TCG colleagues suggested to one teacher that focusing on a single student for the entire year would be too restrictive; she was given ideas that expanded her focus to include the other students. Another teacher was told that expecting 100% improvement from each student was unrealistic. The group helped her reach a percentage that was acceptable and would still show improvement. The teachers were not offended but admitted that these concerns echoed their own. Each teacher left the meeting with a clear focus and several ideas for their gameplans.

As the year progressed, the role of facilitator naturally lessened. The individual members of the group actually began to assume roles unintentionally. For example, if the group began to wander, a member would focus attention back to the matter at hand. The non-threatening tone of the meetings allowed each teacher to share his or her gameplan and results with the group. The experiences of actually observing one another while implementing the new ideas allowed specific feedback as to what went well and led to suggestions for improvement. The TCG meetings became a welcomed sharing time; the

teachers were there to support each other, and not to criticize. In this way, teachers who felt that they had hit a "brick wall" with nowhere to turn were given extra support as well as practical ideas to try. Not only were ideas exchanged but so were badly needed materials. This concept of sharing ideas and materials was infectious and quickly spread through the entire school. Some teachers actually dug deep into cabinets and dusted off materials that they had long forgotten. The experiences of three teachers help to give insight into the workability of the TCG.

Teacher A. Teacher A had a first/second grade combination and wanted to develop activities in which the entire class could participate. She had the idea of cooperative learning groups but had read articles offering little hope for success with primary-age children. Implementing such groups was an uncertain challenge. The group urged her to "go for it." The group helped her decide that social studies units with their high-interest topics would lend themselves to cooperative learning groups. Through experimentation and feedback from the group, Teacher A found that grouping children in pairs, being mindful of personalities, and later combining into groups of four worked well with young children. An example of a gameplan that worked well for Teacher A centered around an activity which focused on the organs of the human body. Each group was responsible for learning all they could about a specific organ. They researched it, illustrated it, and reported on it. The class then met as a whole to combine the various organs to form the human body. Even the most timid students felt as though they had an important part in the project.

Teacher A summarized how the TCG helped her change and improve her teaching: "The TCG forced me to learn another way of teaching. Without the support of the group, it would have been difficult to try such an undertaking with first and second graders."

Teacher B. Teacher B came to the group with a unique problem. How could she be innovative with the responsibility of 28 students, 13 of whom were remedial? She was overwhelmed by the amount of paperwork required by the state. With much thought and

suggestions from the group, she decided to implement learning centers which had high-interest appeal, allowed mobility, and were easily assessed and documented. This focus helped to both free the teacher's time and foster student independent work habits and organizational skills. Parents were impressed by the fact that at the end of the year 11 of the 13 remedial students passed the CRT on the first try and the other two students passed on the second attempt.

Teacher B summarized her TCG experience: "The TCG made me constantly ask myself if I were motivating my students. It got me off my butt and I started teaching. I gave more activities and less worksheets."

Teacher C. Teacher C's year-long focus was to provide a more structured extension of assignments for gifted/fast learners. One problem with the primary-age fast learners is that they often lack independent work habits associated with older students. The fact that the TCG teachers knew the students was a tremendous help. One teacher had taught one of the students the year before. Peer suggestions helped Teacher C set realistic expectations and add needed structure. Teacher C could better use her time between meeting needs of regular students and those of fast learners.

One gameplan that worked extremely well for Teacher C involved "class reporters." Regular assignments were extended to include research skills. The class reporters researched topics and shared them with the class through discussion and illustration which was followed by a question and answer period. By the end of the period, everyone was involved in discussion. Other students also became class reporters who could share information with their own class and other grade levels too. Teacher C summarized her TCG experience: "The group's advice brought back ideas that I had forgotten... and made me adjust my teaching style to meet the needs of my students."

The other three members of the group had equally successful experiences. When asked if the TCG experience was worth the effort, a resounding "Yes!" was heard from each teacher: "I didn't end up doing the same thing all the time. I could try new things and

not worry if it didn't work out because I had the support of my colleagues." "It was one of the most valuable educational experiences that I have ever had." "Even with the different grade levels, it was interesting that teachers could share common problems and work through them together." "It was almost a gift to take school time for something as important as sharing ideas and receiving support from my peers." "The children were so involved that they didn't realize that they were actually learning a skill." Temple Elementary's experience with TCG can serve as an example to educators of what can be accomplished when teachers work cooperatively with one another.

Summary: Organizational Levels and School Collaboration, Change, and Improvement

This case study consisted of collaboration, change, and improvement at five organizational levels: IHE, superintendent, central office, principal, and teacher. Generally, the professor, superintendent, and central office administrator played initiator, facilitator, and problem-solving roles **supporting** the TCG process at the school site. Other than the first year (when the professor was the group facilitator) these levels generally were not involved in the change and improvement processes. Collaboration for genuine change and improvement could only happen at the school site and this collaboration consisted of daily interactions between principal and teachers. This successful school-IHE collaboration started at the superintendent-IHE level--and perhaps this support was needed first--but they ultimately were played out in the schools themselves.

How Does This Case Study Compare with the School Change/Improvement Literature?

Despite top-down, state-driven school reform (e.g. increased graduation requirements, competency testing of teachers) since 1983, some observers have questioned whether our schools are improving (Boyer, 1988; Wayson, 1988; Wise, 1988). If we really want our schools to improve, we might remember the monitory tone of the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession (1986):

> Professionals are presumed to know what they are doing and are paid to exercise their judgment. Schools, on the other hand, operate as if consultants, school district experts, textbook authors, trainers, and distant officials possess more relevant experience than the teachers in the schools. . . . Properly staffed schools can only succeed if they operate on the principle that the essential resource is already inside the school: determined, intelligent, and capable teachers. (pp. 57-58)

Collaboration, change and improvement are interrelated processes. Astuto (1984) concluded that support from the top first is necessary for long-lasting innovations. The TGC case study demonstrates the professor and the principal obtaining such top-down support from the superintendent, who then collaborated with the dean of education to provide for substitute teachers. Successful implementation of an innovation is directly related to administrator support (Orlich, 1973; Havelock, 1968; and Carlson, 1965). This case study's collaborative process had administrative support at the superintendent, central office, and, perhaps most importantly, the school levels. Also, Craven (1978) and Greenwood (1975) concluded that a critical number of advocates are needed before an innovation can be implemented. This collaboration between an IHE and a school district created an ideal mix of advocacy (i.e. for school improvement) since the idea came from the IHE, which then worked with the district to implement this idea. Sickler (1988) provides a convincing case study that shows how teacher empowerment allowed a critical mass of teachers to make decisions and offered an incentive for the superintendent to encourage teachers to spend more time on designing curriculum, solving problems, and implementing needed changes. Collaboration among teachers in the Temple TCG (as teachers supported each other in implementing instructional classroom changes) was a start in empowering teachers to make long range school improvement such as that described by Stickler's study of ABC Unified School District in Cerritos, California.

Collaboration and Change Resulting in Teacher Improvement

This case study emphasizes the ambiguous process of collaboration and change. Wolcott (1977) and Charters et al. (1973) support the generalization that directives alone (i.e. memos from the central office) are rarely effective in stimulating innovation or reform. That is, change can not be instituted by central office memoranda. Encouraging and supporting the Carroll County schools and teachers to change and improve was a complex, situational process requiring the intense efforts of many gameplayers interacting at several levels (IHE, superintendency, central office, school, teacher). Whereas support and conceptualization (i.e. a clear definition and focus of the idea to be implemented) might be necessary from the top, projects are made or abandoned at the school level. IHEs should consider roles and strategies enabling them to work closely with the schools in helping them with ideas that can contribute to improving schools.

Just providing the ideas, however, may be insufficient. IHEs also might need to continue working with the schools in helping to implement these ideas. Professors, principals, and central office administrators need to collaborate on a situational basis both to solve problems jeopardizing the project and to take advantage of opportunities (e.g. peer observation, workshops, orientations) that can improve on-going projects. Schools are frantic places currently under even more pressure than usual since state departments of education have become school improvement agents and are requiring considerable paperwork for the Accountability Movement. Unless IHEs and districts are willing to collaborate at several levels, including those described above, schools may have a tendency to do business as usual and not change if only because time is such a precious commodity and school norms so ingrained.

An Implication for Preparation of Administrators

The literature is replete with examples of case studies on school-IHE collaborative efforts (e.g. Ishler & Leslie, 1987; Maloy & Jones, 1987; Crews & Pierce, 1986; and Pine & Keane, 1986). If school-IHE collaboration becomes a common and perhaps a state-

mandated practice (Hoyle, 1989), more case studies will be needed to describe the process of how successful school improvement projects and programs occur. (For instance, collaboration, as this paper indicates, is a multi-tier process.) These case studies might be used in educational administration (EA) courses to provide clinical experiences for aspiring administrators. Professors could use these case studies to help their students identify critical ingredients that make change and implementation practices likely to be successful. As new structures like school-based management, instructional lead teachers, mentoring, and participatory decision-making highlight the current movement to flatten our school district organizations, EA professors may need to form collaborative arrangements with local school districts to stay current with the new school improvement movement.

References

Boyer, E. (1988). Report on school reform: The teachers speak. New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Carlson, R. O. (1965). Adoption of educational innovations. Eugene: University of Oregon, Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration.

Charters, W. W., Jr. et al. (1973). The process of planned change in the school's instructional organization. Eugene: University of Oregon, Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration.

Craven, E. M. (1978). An evaluation of an implementation model for elementary school science. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Pullman: Washington State University.

Crews, W. C., & Pierce, J. R. (1986). Public school system and community college: A successful collaboration. The School Counselor, 34(7), 32-35.

Glickman, C. D. (1989). Has Sam and Samantha's time come at last? Educational Leadership 46(8), 4-9.

Goodlad, J. I. (1984). A place called school. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Havelock, R. G. (1968). Dissemination and translation roles. In T. L. Eidell and J. M. Kitchel (eds.) Knowledge production and utilization in educational administration. Eugene: University of Oregon, Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration.

Hoyle, J. R. (1989). Uniting university and public school systems. The School Administrator, 4(46), 4-14.

Ishler, R. E. & Leslie, E. C. (1987). Bridging the gap between a public school system and a university. Phi Delta Kappan, 68, 615-616.

Jackson, P. (1968). Life in the classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Kelley, E. C. (1951). The workshop way of learning. New York: Harper and Row, Inc.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). School teacher: A sociological study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Maloy, R. W., & Jones, B. L. (1987). Teachers, partnerships, and school improvement. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 20(2), 19-24.

National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983). A nation at risk: Imperative for school reform. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Orlich, D. C., May, F. B., & Harder, R. J. (1973). Change agents and instructional innovations: Report II. Elementary School Journal 73, 390-398.

Pine, G. J., and Keane, W. G. (1986). Tearing down the wall: Collaboration among educational institutions. ERS Spectrum, 4(1), 27-32.

Sickler, J. L. (1988). Teachers in charge: Empowering the professionals. Phi Delta Kappan, 69, 354-356, 375-6.

Wayson, W.W. (1988). Up from excellence: The impact of the excellence movement on schools. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Wise, A. (1988). The two conflicting trends of school reform. Legislated learning revisited. Phi Delta Kappan, 69, 328-333.

Wolcott, H. F. (1977). Teachers vs. technocrats: An educational innovation in anthropological perspective. Eugene: University of Oregon, Center for Educational Policy and Management.

John L. Keedy, Ed.D.

GENERAL MEETING FORMAT FOR TEACHER COLLEGIAL GROUPS

John L. Keedy West Georgia College

(1) Informal sharing / Article critique
(12:30 - 1:10)

(2) Presentations (1:10 - 3:15)
*Minimum time per presentation (15 minutes)
*Break (20 minutes)
*Extra time for "run-overs" (15 minutes)

(3) Teacher assessments or journal writing
(15 minutes)

John L. Keedy, Ed.D.

ANALYSIS/CRITIQUE FORMAT FOR TCG PRESENTATIONS

John L. Keedy West Georgia College

(1) Statement of last meeting's Game-plan.

(2) Presentor description, analysis, and critique of Game-plan implementation.

(3) Peer observation analysis/critique.

(4) Group analysis/critique to identify assessment of Year-long Focus.

(5) Group advice/suggestions, encouragement, support for new Game-plan.

(6) Presentor formulation of new Game-plan.